DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 211 HE 014 690

AUTHOR Stilwell, Doris N.; And Others
TITLE Social Work Education: Accessible to the Handicapped?
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accessibility (for Disabled); Admission Criteria; Ancillary School Services; *College Admission; College Students; *Disabilities; Graduate Study; Hearing Impairments; Higher Education; Physical Disabilities; Physical Mobility; *Professional Education; Sensory Aids; *Social Work; *Structural Elements (Construction); Student Needs; Undergraduate Study; Visual Impairments

ABSTRACT

A survey of professional training programs accredited by the Council on Social Work Education was conducted to determine the degree to which the institutions and programs are accessible to students with handicaps. Responses to a 34-item questionnaire were obtained from 21 to 40 graduate programs, 91 of 230 undergraduate programs, and 20 of 46 combined programs. Approximately 93 percent of the schools reported admitting all applicants, regardless of their disability. However, implementation of institutional and program admission policies was less consistent. About half of the schools indicated having a written admission policy, and about 70 percent reported the use of flexible admission policies either written or unwritten. All but 10 of the schools have a program or service especially designed to assist students with visual impairments. A majority of the reporting programs have made an effort to develop social programs and services for social work students with handicaps. Challenges facing students with auditory handicaps include: no telephones with amplifiers at about 42 percent of the schools. Nearly 80 percent indicated that entrance ramps are available for half or more of their buildings. Information is also presented on designated parking, curb cuts, living areas, elevators, libraries, and other architectural features. Recommendations include providing information about accessibility features in catalogs and publications and expanding an active human services program for handicapped students. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212211

SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION: ACCESSIBLE TO THE HANDICAPPED?

Doris N. Stilwell[1]
University of Kentucky

Mary Jane Nowak[2]
Arizona State University

and

William E. Stilwell[3]
University of Kentucky

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William E. Stilwell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NOTES:

1. Doris N. Stilwell, M.S.W., A.C.S.W., C.R.C. is an assistant professor, assigned to the Graduate Program in Rehabilitation Counseling, Graduate School, University of Kentucky.
2. Mary Jane Nowak, Ph.D., A.C.S.W., is an associate professor, College of Social Work, Arizona State University.
3. William E. Stilwell, Ph.D., is a professor, Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology, College of Education, University of Kentucky.

HE 014 690

SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION: ACCESSIBLE TO THE HANDICAPPED?

Abstract

Social work students with handicaps enrolled in higher education meet many policy, social, and architectural barriers. This national study surveyed the degrees to which Council on Social Work Education accredited undergraduate, graduate, and combined training programs are accessible to students with handicaps. The data on architectural accessibility of classroom buildings and libraries is encouraging. The paper makes 13 recommendations for social and policy changes that could be planned and implemented by institutional and program administrators, faculty and students.

SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION: ACCESSIBLE TO THE HANDICAPPED?

Until very recently, planners, administrators and educators of higher educational programs have overlooked an important population for inclusion in their institutions. This societal component consists of the handicapped--the blind, paraplegic and deaf, to name a few.

Traditionally, the educational needs of the handicapped population have been addressed through special education and/or residential training programs. These services have been far and few between; nowhere near meeting the needs of the handicapped population of this country. Until recently few handicapped persons have been able to attain an education because it was not accessible. Policy, social and architectural barriers confronted many handicapped persons and denied them their civil rights. Reasons for the exclusion of the handicapped are varied: renovations are expensive; few students benefit from institutional efforts; and, the handicapped students have not been advocacy oriented.

Hutchins stated that "the physically disabled can be regarded as a minority group in several respects: their status is ascribed in the sense that few, if any, choose to be disabled anymore than one chooses to be Black, female, or old; and they are subject to much prejudice and discrimination in a society geared to the able-bodied. Many of the demands of the physically disabled are currently making for affirmative action and civil rights are predicted on the same rationale as the demands made by those earlier in human rights movements."[2]

In pursuing higher educational goals social work students with handicaps meet many policy, social and architectural barriers. The challenges for students and administrators in general, are becoming more common, such as, a handicapped student is denied admission to a professional training program and begins an appeal process; a deaf student goes to court to obtain the services of an interpreter;[3] and, a student in a motorized wheelchair cannot meet his/her counselor because the counseling center is inaccessible.

How well are university and college administrators minimizing the barriers encountered by students with handicaps? The information gained in answering this question can be useful to administrators and college student personnel professionals in making decisions about resource allocations. The handicapped will find the information useful in making their educational and life-career plans.

Previous efforts have tried to develop partial answers to this challenging question. Dailey, Rusalem and Weinberg have tried to sensitize college administrators and faculty members to the needs of students who are handicapped.[4] Penn and Dudley found that higher education students desire to become independent and see education as a way to reach their goal, but handicapped students need help to overcome such challenges as psychological fears, architectural barriers, adjustment to academic schedules and social isolation.[5]

In 1973 Stilwell and Schulker collected data which suggested higher education administrators frequently had developed open admission policies for students with handicaps. However, the same institutions had often failed to develop the services to support students with handicaps (e.g., volunteer readers and attendants) and to make physical adjustments for students (e.g., curb cuts, lowered water fountains

and telephones). Based upon questionnaire data Stilwell and Schulker suggested a number of inexpensive and immediate changes as well as several expensive and programmatic changes to minimize the policy, social and architectural barriers confronting students with handicaps.[6]

Two very important pieces of federal legislation have had an impact on higher education. The Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 required any new facility built with federal funds to be fully accessible to handicapped persons. More recently Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 mandated institutional accessibility--in every way--to persons with handicaps. During the intervening years institutions of higher education have spent a great deal of money to bring their buildings into compliance with federal legislation.[7]

There are many definitions for who is disabled or handicapped. These definitions include some people but exclude others. Some are intended to be an umbrella under which people may qualify for programs which have a narrow focus and specific definitions for acceptance. Many factors enter into the identification of who is or is not disabled. Fay states these factors are "body impairments, the functional limitations resulting from the impairment, the environment, education, age, community and employer attitudes, and, equally if not of greater importance, the self image of the person with the impairment."[8] Thus, it is difficult to define the population designated "handicapped." It is estimated there are "seven million children and at least twenty-eight million adults with mental or physical handicaps" in the United States.[9]

To date, no systematic data have been collected and published on how social work programs meet the accessibility requirements of handicapped students, particularly in the domains of policy, social and

architectural barriers. The present study allows us to examine CSWE accredited BSW and MSW programs and their parent institutions' responsiveness to federal directives and to perceived social needs.

METHODOLOGY

Instrument

A 34 item questionnaire was adapted from two earlier instruments. Adaptations of the questionnaire included stating questions separately for graduate and undergraduate programs and providing space for explaining if a program differed from the host institution.[10] The questionnaire and study were reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Committee at Arizona State University.

The questionnaire was designed to collect data on social work training program's policies on admission and orientation; and, on social and architectural barriers effecting participation of students in wheelchairs, students with visual or auditory impairments, and students with systemic-neurological handicaps.

Population

In 1980-81, the Council on Social Work Education accredited 274 undergraduate and 85 graduate programs. Forty-six institutions had both undergraduate and graduate programs. In instances where a graduate and an undergraduate program were located in one school or organizational unit one questionnaire was sent. Thus, a total of 316 questionnaires were mailed; 40 to programs offering a graduate degree, 230 to programs offering an undergraduate degree; and 46 to combination programs, programs offering both degrees.

Schedule

A cover letter and survey questionnaire were sent to the Dean or Director of the 316 CSWE accredited programs. A pre-addressed postage paid envelope was included with each questionnaire. Two post

card follow-up reminders were sent to non-respondents; the first reminder was sent out 3 weeks after the questionnaire, and the second reminder was sent 2 weeks later.

RESULTS

Selected data on policy, social and architectural barriers impacting social work students with handicaps are discussed in this section. Policy barriers include those written statements which could effect a handicapped student's accessibility to a professional training program. Social barriers include social programs and services which enhance the handicapped students participation and communication in higher education. Architectural barriers include physical structures which require renovation under the supervision of an architect or a civil engineer. The data presented are by program type--graduate, combined (programs offering degrees at both the graduate and undergraduate levels), and undergraduates.

Typically the Dean or Program Director completed the questionnaire (78%). The data were collected from 21 of 40 graduate programs, 20 of 46 combined programs, and 91 of 230 undergraduate programs. The overall response rate to the questionnaire was an acceptable 42%.

Policy Barriers

Eleven questionnaire items collected information on the reporting institutions' policies governing various aspects of disability (see Table 1).

- -

Insert Table 1 about here

- -

The authors anticipated consistent admission policies concerning social work students with handicaps. One hundred twenty-three of the responding schools (93.2%) reported admitting all applicants, regardless of their disability. Admission policies within the program types were similar to their host institutions.

Implementation of institutional and program admission policies was less consistent. About half of the reporting institutions (70 of 132) indicated having a written admission policy. The majority of the institutions reported the use of flexible admission policies either written or unwritten (70.5%). Seventy-six out of 111 undergraduate programs reported the use of flexible admission policies (68%). The majority (73%) of the flexible admission policies were unwritten. Fifteen undergraduate programs reported having no admission policy. Graduate programs reported the use of flexible admission policies either written or unwritten (86%).

Institutions and programs are required by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and appropriate Executive Orders to provide assistance for students with visual and hearing impairments.[11] All but ten of the reporting schools have a program or service especially designed to assist students with visual impairments. The data showed institutional and programmatic recognition of the blind students: assistance was provided to find a reader (77.3%), assistance was available to tape assignments (37.1%), and a volunteer service was available (18.2%). A majority of the institutions allowed different gender readers in a visually impaired student's room (59.8%). Fifty of the responding institutions indicated that reserve books are recorded for blind students.

Some students with invisible handicaps (e.g., asthma, diabetes, and epilepsy) enroll in social work training programs. Only three of the 132 responding institutions reported having a designated emergency care person for each building. Typically emergency treatment was found at the student health services (32.6%).

Social barriers

Seven questionnaire items gathered important information on the reporting institutions human services and communication programs. Several selected items will be presented in this section (see Table 2).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 2 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

A majority of the reporting programs have made an effort to develop social programs and services for social work students with handicaps. These individuals seem to be involved in the special orientation programs which occur before class (43.2%), which provide written information (43.2%), or which use volunteers (49.2%). Some disabled students are not able to attend an institution of higher education without an attendant to provide care in daily living. The responding programs generally help link students to attendants in one of two ways: a volunteer service is available 31%, or assistance in locating an attendant is provided 39%. Also, 39% of the institutions have a policy admitting attendants to extracurricular activities at no extra charge. The social needs of handicapped students appear to be unevenly met.

There are diverse challenges facing students with auditory handicaps which include: (1) no telephones with amplifiers at 41.7% percent of the reporting schools, (2) no amplification available for

lectures at 35.6 percent of the schools, and (3) no telecommunication (TTY) devices at 46.7 percent of the schools. The only encouraging word for the social work students with communication deficits is that one-fifth of the schools provide an interpreter for selected lectures.

Architectural barriers

Twelve questionnaire items focused on the numerous architectural barriers which can challenge social work students with handicaps. The intensity of these challenges is discussed in this section (see Table 3).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 3 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Ramps. Nearly 80% (N=104) of the reporting institutions indicated that entrance ramps were available for half or more of their buildings. Nearly half of the reporting institutions libraries are completely accessible within the building (43.2%). Only five institutions indicated that their libraries did not have accessible entrance ramps.

Designated parking. Eight out of ten institutions (80.3%) do have some kind of parking specially designated for the handicapped; marked parking spaces 70%; or free lots for the handicapped, 10%.

Curb cuts. The questionnaire data showed that 60.6 percent of the schools reported all or most of the curbs were sloping to facilitate students in wheelchair movements about campus. However, 34 of the reporting institutions indicated few or no sloping curbs.

Living areas. Students in wheelchairs have difficulties in classroom buildings and in their dormatories. Less than half of the library and/or classroom bathrooms are large enough to accomodate wheelchairs (43.2%). About the same percentage of institutions

indicated that some bathrooms were accessible (42.4%). The challenge is further compounded when only half of the reporting institutions have made some provisions for students in wheelchairs (47.7%). Twenty-one of the schools indicated that their handicapped students do have access to large bathrooms equipped with handrails.

Automatic door openers. Mobility and independency seemed to be challenged at a majority of the reporting schools. Less than ten percent of the institutions have half or more of their buildings equipped with automatic door openers.

Elevators. The majority of the reporting schools indicated that elevators and keys were available to students with handicaps.

Low telephones and water fountains. Making a telephone call or getting a drink of water can be quite a challenge for a person in a wheelchair. More than half of the reporting institutions (53.8%) indicated a majority of the buildings do have low public telephones. Similarly nearly half of the institutions (40.2%) indicated that a majority of their buildings do have low water fountains.

Braille markings on doors/buildings. Almost 46% of the responding programs reported no braille markings on doors or buildings. Another 5% reported never having considered braille markings important.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The foregoing data offer a generalized picture of social work programs and their host institutions responsiveness to the policy, social and architectural barriers confronting students with handicaps. As a rule, the programs did not differ from their host institutions.

Policy barriers

Policy barriers included the wide range of institutional decisions influencing resources delivered to social work students with

handicaps. The administrative responses have been uneven. In the area of admissions, the reported institutional policies indicate a preferance for written and flexible policies. Further these institutional policies seem to govern program policies such that the latter is similar to the former. Table 1 shows that administrative policies have helped students with auditory and with visual handicaps gain access to libraries for taped texts and for readers. Table 1 shows an anticipated finding--few institutions have designated an emergency treatment person in each building. In the area of policy barriers the following recommendations are made:

1. ensure each institutional catalogue and program publications list accessibility characteristics;
2. employ persons with handicaps to raise awareness among the institutional community; and,
3. designate an emergency care contact person for each building.

Social barriers

Social and communication patterns appear to be interdependent. Progress in one area seems to lead to improvement in the other area. Thus, the development of special counselor and special orientation programs for social work students with handicaps is encouraging. In contrast Table 2 shows that dramatic progress can still be made to expand the volunteer attendant services for academic and for social purposes. In the particular communications areas Table 2 shows that very little progress has been made to help the auditorily handicapped students. In the area of social and communications barriers, the following recommendations are made:

1. stimulate the organization of comprehensive volunteer programs to augment the campus human service programs;
2. expand an active human service program (e.g., counseling and housing) for all students with handicaps;

3. create an advisory board of students and employees with handicaps to advise the institution's human services delivery system (e.g., install automatic door openers for the majestic doors on the new classroom building);

4. install sound amplifiers on the systems which are most used by auditorily handicapped students; and,

5. promote social awareness programs for students with handicaps such that other faculty and students become involved in helping the institution meet the needs of social work students with handicaps.

Architectural barriers

Since the passage of key federal legislation related to the education and training of handicapped students, universities and professional programs have had the opportunity to reduce many of the architectural barriers to classroom buildings and libraries. A large majority of the reporting institutions (typically 60-80%) Table 3 indicates that buildings and libraries had entrance ramps, that designated handicapped parking spaces were available, and that curb cuts had been installed. On more subtle changes such as living areas, low telephones, braille signs and low water fountains the level of institutional responsiveness appeared to be much lower. In the area of architectural barriers, the following recommendations are made:

1. develop an institutional map showing the "best routes" for handicapped person's travel about the campus;

2. modify select dormatory suites or identify off-campus housing to provide accessible living areas for handicapped students;

3 install braille signs wherever needed;

4. renovate at least one water fountain per building to be accessible to handicapped social work students; and,

5. request the telephone company to make one unit per building accessible.

SUMMARY

The 1980-1981 CSWC accredited professional training programs were asked to complete a questionnaire on the degree to which their institutions and program are accessible to students with handicaps. The study provided information which shows that potential students will want to be careful in selecting their undergraduate or graduate training program. The admissions practices and human service programs for handicapped students appear to be developing. Once enrolled in the institution the handicapped person will still meet challenges which impinge upon their quality of life. In the present period of financial restraint both handicapped students and their advocates will want to exert their influence upon institutional decision makers to implement accessible social work training programs.

Table 1

Policy Barriers Effecting

Social Work Students with Handicaps

Category/Question	Graduate Programs	Combined Programs	Undergraduate Programs	Overall Percent
Policy Barriers				
Admission policy				
Admit all	19	19	85	93.2
Admit mildly disabled			1	.8
Other	1		3	3.0
Undergraduate Admission				
Admit all		20	83	N/A
Admit mildly disabled		0	1	N/A
Other		0	4	N/A
Graduate Admission				
Admit all	19	17		N/A
Other	1	0		N/A
Institution policy				
Written-inflexible	1	1	8	7.6
Unwritten-flexible	6	6	21	25.0
Written-flexible	11	12	37	45.5
No policy	0	1	12	9.8
Specific policy	1	0	0	.8
Other	0	0	6	4.5
Don't know	0	0	1	.8
Reader to Tape Assignments				
Assistance to find someone	15	16	71	77.3
No assistance to find someone	0	1	4	3.8
Volunteer reading service	3	6	15	18.2
Place free ads/campus newspaper	2	1	9	9.1
Assistance to tape assignments	7	9	33	37.1
Assistance only for blind	1	0	0	.8
Other	3	0	4	5.3
Don't know	0	0	4	3.0
Program differs	0	1	1	1.5

TABLE 1 Cont.

Category/Question	Graduate Programs	Combined Programs	Undergraduate Programs	Overall Percent
Quiet place for reader to read				
Readers to room regardless of sex	11	12	56	59.8
Special reading rooms in students housing	1	1	5	5.3
Students room if same sex	0	1	4	3.8
Work out own method	1	1	5	5.3
Other	5	0	5	7.6
Don't know	0	2	8	7.6
Difficulty securing library books				
Special rooms in library	6	10	41	43.2
Reserve books-recorded	11	6	33	37.9
Other books for extended time	8	3	23	25.8
No special provisions	4	1	7	9.1
Other	1	4	5	7.6
Don't know	2	0	10	9.8
Emergency treatment				
Designated person in each building	0	0	3	2.3
Most buildings have person	0	0	3	2.3
Student health services	17	16	73	80.3
Central campus service	7	8	28	32.6
Other	1	0	2	2.3
Don't know	0	1	3	4.0

Table 2

Social Barriers Effecting

Social Work Students with Handicaps

Category/Question	Graduate Programs	Combined Programs	Undergraduate Programs	Overall Percent
Social Barriers				
Special counselor/program				
Special counselor	14	16	48	59.1
Special activities	5	6	18	22.0
Some special facilities	16	11	50	58.3
No special arrangements	0	0	13	9.8
Other answers	0	1	13	10.6
Special Orientation				
Occurs before class	8	14	35	43.2
Provides written info	7	11	39	43.2
Volunteers	12	9	44	49.2
Other	3	0	6	6.8
Don't know	0	0	5	3.8
Attendant services				
Volunteer service available	2	5	34	31.1
Assistant to find attendant	13	9	30	39.4
No assistance	1	2	9	9.1
Free Ads	0	0	3	2.3
Other	1	1	2	3.0
Don't know	0	2	8	7.6
Extra curricular events				
Attendant attend no charge	7	3	41	38.6
Attendant pay extra ticket	2	7	7	12.1
No provision	1	0	3	3.0
Separate seating	2	2	9	9.8
No separate seating	0	1	1	1.5
Locations in accessible	0	1	1	1.5
Other	5	2	5	9.1
Don't know	1	4	18	17.4
Telephone amplifiers				
All buildings have one	0	1	2	2.3
Most buildings	1	0	1	1.5
Half the buildings	0	0	3	2.3
Scattered phones	4	7	16	20.5
No phones	11	3	41	41.7
Other	3	1	8	9.1
Don't know	2	6	14	16.7
Program differs	3	0	0	2.3

TABLE 2 Cont.

Category/Question	Graduate Programs	Combined Programs	Undergraduate Programs	Overall Percent
Amplifications in Lectures				
Headphones	1	0	6	5.3
Loudspeaker system	2	2	3	5.3
No microphone	6	4	37	35.6
An interpreter	4	5	18	20.5
Other	6	3	12	15.9
Don't know	0	3	9	9.o
Telecommunications devices				
One TTY	5	4	12	15.9
Several TTY's	0	3	7	7.6
No TTY's	10	5	48	46.7
Other	1	1	3	3.8
Don't know	1	3	16	15.2

Table 3

Architectural Barriers Effecting

Social Work Students with Handicaps

Category/Question	Graduate Programs	Combined Programs	Undergraduate Programs	Overall Percent
Architectural Barriers				
Building entrance ramps				
None to any building	0	0	1	.8
Ramps to all buildings	7	12	43	47.0
Ramps to half or more	9	6	27	31.8
Ramps to few buildings	3	2	12	12.9
Ramps to at least one	0	0	5	3.8
Temporary ramps	1	0	1	1.5
Other	1	0	2	2.3
Library entrance ramps (institution)				
Yes	16	17	74	81.1
No	0	0	5	3.8
All floors accessible	8	9	40	43.2
Some areas accessible	2	2	6	7.8
Other	2	0	1	2.3
Parking facilities				
Handicapped parking	11	15	66	69.7
Free handicapped lots	2	0	12	10.6
No special parking	2	1	6	6.8
Other	5	2	5	9.1
Don't know	0	2	1	2.3
Difficulty crossing street				
Sloping curbs	12	10	53	56.8
Few sloping curbs	3	6	20	22.0
No sloping curbs	0	0	5	3.8
Other	3	1	9	9.8
Most sloping curbs	1	3	1	3.8
Don't know	0	0	1	.8
Library/classroom buildings bathrooms				
All bathrooms large enough	6	9	42	43.2
Handrails, small bathrooms	0	0	3	2.3
Accommodate wheelchairs, but no rails	1	3	8	9.1
No buildings accessible	0	0	3	2.3
Some buildings accessible	12	9	35	42.4
Other	2	0	3	3.8
Program differs	2	0	1	2.3

TABLE 3 cont.

Category/Question	Graduate Programs	Combined Programs	Undergraduate Programs	Overall Percent
Living areas				
Large bathroom & handrails	3	3	15	15.9
Accommodate wheelchair but no handrails	0	2	1	2.3
No housing available	1	0	5	4.5
Some provisions for wheelchairs	13	7	43	47.7
All housing	1	5	11	12.9
Other	3	2	4	6.8
Don't know	0	4	10	10.6
Automatic door openers				
Each building	1	1	2	3.0
More than half buildings	1	3	3	5.3
Few doors with buildings	10	12	28	37.9
No doors equipped	9	3	52	48.5
Never considered	0	0	1	.8
Others	0	0	3	2.3
Don't know	0	1	0	.8
Elevators and keys				
All buildings are accessible and keys available	8	10	34	39.4
Some buildings, as needed	10	7	37	40.9
No elevator keys available	0	0	3	2.3
No elevators	1	1	5	5.3
No elevators, but accessible				
Other	0	0	4	3.0
Don't know	2	1	7	7.6
Program differs	2	0	1	2.3
Lower level public phones				
All buildings have one	6	5	24	26.5
Most of the buildings	5	6	25	27.3
Half of the buildings	2	4	6	9.1
Few phones	5	3	23	22.7
No phones	1	0	8	6.8
Other	1	0	2	2.3
Don't know	0	1	3	3.0
Program differs	0	0	1	.8
Low water fountains				
All buildings have one	3	8	11	16.7
Most buildings	5	4	22	23.5
Half of the buildings	2	2	9	9.8
Few fountains	7	4	23	25.8
No fountains	3	0	21	18.2
Other	0	0	2	1.5
Don't know	1	1	2	3.0

TABLE 3 cont.

Category/Question	Graduate Programs	Combined Programs	Undergraduate Programs	Overall Percent
Braille on doors/buildings				
All buildings	2	4	10	12.1
Some buildings	7	7	18	24.2
No braille	7	3	50	45.5
Never considered important	1	1	5	5.3
Other	3	2	3	6.1
Don't know	0	2	5	5.3

Notes:

1. The project was supported by a University of Kentucky Research Foundation mini-grant to the senior author.

2. Trova K. Hutchins, "Affirmative Action for the Physically Disabled in Social Work Education," Journal of Social Work Education, Vol. 14 (Fall, 1978), pp 64-70.

3. see summary of Schornstein v. The New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services in Handicapped Americans Reports, Vol. 4 (September 10, 1981), p. 5.

4. Anne L. Dailey, "Spinal Cord Injured Students: Guidance and Counseling Approaches," Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 20 (July, 1979), pp. 341-346; Herbert Rusalem, Guiding the Physically Handicapped Student (New York: Teachers College, 1962); and Lauren K. Weinberg, "Unique Learning Needs of Physically Handicapped Social Work Students," Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 14 (Winter, 1978), pp. 110-117.

5. J. Roger Penn and David H. Dudley, "The Handicapped Student: Problems and Perceptions," Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 21 (July, 1980), pp. 354-357.

6. William E. Stilwell and Sharon Schulker, "Facilities Available to Disabled Higher Education Students," Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 14 (September, 1973), pp. 419-424.

7. Laurel J. Radow, "Comparative Expenditure Data for Accomodating Handicapped Students," Vol. 14 (March, 1981), pp. 22-27; see also Management of Accessiblity for Handicapped Students in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: National Association fo College and University

Business Officers).

8. Frederick Fay, "Problems of the Severely and Multiply Handicapped," in The White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals Awareness Papers (Washington, D. C.: DHEW, 1977), p. 290.

9. ibid, p. 290.

10. Stilwell and Schulker, op. cit., 419-424; and Doris N. Stilwell, William E. Stilwell and Lea C. Perritt, "Barriers in Higher Education for Persons with Handicaps: A Follow-up," unpublished manuscript, University of Kentucky, 1981.

11. Dailey, op. cit.